9/30/72

Dear Carl,

I'm sorry I didn't have time to drop over when I was in town yesterday. I wanted to beat rush-hour traffic and 703 is under construction. In itself that takes an extra half-hour at rush-hour. You didn't understand and I think have not from the first understood the interests I have tried to generate in some of the things you regard as of the past and hence not news.

I can, of course, understand that in a story of this magnitude, there is an enormous amount of work to do. Considering the journalistic coups you and Bob have pulled, one must assume you have spent much time on this work. Hence my reference to man-power yesterday.

Although I could argue that on some stories the past is news, witness Vietnam and Lavelle now, and I believe in this case there are parallels, I do not. Everything I have suggested to you and Bob from the first has been pointed ahead, the tracing this story to the White House. This includes even the suggestion that you check or get for me to check for you the political-funds reporting(s) of the Committee of Cuban-Americans for Nixon-Agnew. If the prospects of a ten-strike on it are not great, they do, in my opinion and with my knowledge of these people and their past, exist. Your yesterday's story validates my "instant analysis" of June, the time the thing came to light, so I suggest that my analyses are sometimes within the ballpark.

This is particularly true of Hunt. I don't and can't regard him as any kind of self-starter. I presume his role here is similar to that in the Bay of Pigs, not the man in supreme command but the man in charge of field operations. There are things about him that have not been and I think can be pieced together. I believe these will taken you down the road you want to travel.

I believe his Littauer and Wilkinson past was not a cover, but part of an active role. This could make a spearate, major story if it could be established. I can't pursue it. There are a few things I might try by phone, but I can t even afford the cost of the calls. Bearing on this, by the way, I have some pretty solid evidence of other CIA activity entirely domestic I think most would regard as improper. Paul Valentine has seen some of it. I think it will eventually be established that he was with the Mullen agency when he was with The Agency. You know Mullen did work for the CIA and in the same area as Hunt. It is beyond reasonable question that his Mullen connection continued after it was reported he was fired. It may be current. I think that unless the indictment compelled a change, it is. It was right before the indictment. I have but have not yet had a chance to read the indictment. From what I've been told about it, I regard failure to mention his known aliases or pen-names while pretending to is something that should not be entirely ignored. When they are publicly known and have been printed, what good reason is there for omitting them? I think because they point to connections officialdom wan't avoided by people like you.

When I suggested to you a short while back that you might want to use the Freedom of Information law to learn the dates of Hunt's post March 29 employment and what government contracts Mullen had and has, I had already taken the initial steps myself. I had earlier suggested this to the Post. Almost all major media have ignored this law, I think to their and public detriment. Had a real effort been made to give it viability, there would today be more public disclosure of what bureaucrats of all parties want to suppress. I am without the capability of pressing this and although I have proceeded pro se in the past believe it would be irresponsible to do it in this case. I made the request of Clawson, in writing. (My first such suit went unreported. I regret this because it was a helluva story on Kleindienst. His heavy-handed arrogance was such that he actually delivered a summary judgement to me gratuitously. I have another case pending in the court of appeals now.)

There is always disagreement over what is and is not enough for a news story. I believe that if you are turned donw on requests for this information, you can piece enough together to make a legitimate story including the refusal to respond. Let me encapsulate the known facts:

Hunt was CIA, and part of its Department of Dirty Tricks.

Hunt was employed by the White House in its Department of Dirty Tricks, Nixon's own.

The White House sought to and in fact did misrepresent his connection and pretended he had no connection with it when he did.

He was still a White House employee at the time he participated in this caper.

At the same time he was part of an agency (not a mere writer but vice president and director) whose known government contract is senseless as explained, which was then using the President's daughter in TV work, and which admits a CIA past. (I suggest that in this case every voluntary admission has served as a cloak for what was not admitted.)

During the time he was still a White House employee he went to Florida.

This trip to Florida coincides with the developing of film from Larry O'Brien's files. (And I may be wrong, but I think some appeared in Anderson's column. One of the men arrested has been a long-time Anderson source. Anderson stood for him when he was arrested.)

So, if you are not told the exact dates of Hunt's White-House service (by now this could have been changed and it is not really relevant, only the White House will pretend it is), and if you are not told what contracts existed with Mullen, does not this in itself make a not-unreasonable story that might, in fact, smoke more out?

Especially when Ziegler chided the Post for not using the Freedom of Information law on the Pentagon Papers?

And does it not seem obvious that during all this period Hunt's daily pay came from either the White House directly or an agency working for the executive branch and for it? Or, that he was not a self-starter but was working for the government, White House, executive branch or both, and was its agent as well as the Creep's at the time of his crimes?

Excuse the haste with which I do this in the early a.m. I am going into town for our weekly grocery shopping as soon as the stores open and will then mail it.

When you get the pages of the city directory for the Washington Bldg for the years beginning with 1965 xeroxed, please add 1835 K St. for the current year, last if it was then completed and occupied. Really, any time after 1969 there was such a building. I don't know when it was completed. You will find that this is a Hunt and a Mullen cover address. Hunt used the Washington Building. I'm telling you that Mullen did and I can't disclose my source. They also coincide. I am reasonably confident the Washington Building management will tell you that Hunt did not rent space there during the years he listed it as his office and as agent for Littauer and Wilkinson. But he did get mail there, I know how and where, and I hope you will see this for yourself. If you do not, I think I can show you how you can. This <u>will</u> include the period in which he was involved in the caper.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg